

Relic Gravitational Waves and Cosmology¹

L. P. Grishchuk

grishchuk@astro.cf.ac.uk

School of Physics and Astronomy, Cardiff University, United Kingdom
and Sternberg Astronomical Institute, Moscow State University, Russia

Abstract

The paper begins with a brief recollection of interactions of the author with Ya B Zeldovich in the context of the study of relic gravitational waves. The principles and early results on the quantum-mechanical generation of cosmological perturbations are then summarized. The expected amplitudes of relic gravitational waves are different in different frequency windows, and therefore the techniques and prospects of their detection are distinct. One section of the paper describes the present state of efforts in direct detection of relic gravitational waves. Another section is devoted to indirect detection via the anisotropy and polarisation measurements of the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB). It is emphasized throughout the paper that the conclusions on the existence and expected amount of relic gravitational waves are based on a solid theoretical foundation and the best available cosmological observations. I also explain in great detail what went wrong with the so-called ‘inflationary gravitational waves’, whose amount is predicted by inflationary theorists to be negligibly small, thus depriving them of any observational significance.

1 Introduction

The story of relic gravitational waves has revealed the character of Ya. B. Zeldovich not only as a great scientist but also as a great personality. One should remember that the beginning of the 1970’s was dominated by the belief that massless particles, such as photons, neutrinos, gravitons, cannot be created

¹A contribution to the international conference on cosmology and high-energy astrophysics “Zeldovich-90” held in Moscow, 20-24 December, 2004; <http://hea.iki.rssi.ru/Z-90/>

by the gravitational field of a homogeneous isotropic universe. Zeldovich shared this view and was publishing papers supporting this picture. He was enthusiastic about cosmological particle creation [1] and contributed a lot (together with coauthors) to this subject. However, he thought that something interesting and important could only happen if the early universe was highly anisotropic.

When I showed [2, 3] that massless gravitons (gravitational waves) could, in fact, be created by the gravitational field of a homogeneous isotropic universe, a considerable debate arose around this work. I argued that the coupling of gravitons to the ‘external’ gravitational field follows unambiguously from the equations of general relativity, and it differs from the coupling of other known massless particles to gravity. In contrast to other massless fields, this specific coupling of gravitational waves allows their superadiabatic (parametric) amplification by the ‘pumping’ gravitational field of a nonstationary universe. (A similar coupling to gravity can be postulated for the still hypothetical massless scalar field.) If classical gravitational waves were present before the era of amplification, they would have been amplified. But their presense is not of necessity: even if the waves are initially in their quantum-mechanical vacuum (ground) state, the state will inevitably evolve into a multi-particle state. In phenomenological language, gravitational waves are being generated from their zero-point quantum oscillations.

The intense debate has finished in a surprising and very flattering way for me. It is common knowledge that it was virtually impossible to win a scientific bet against Zeldovich - he knew practically everything about physics and had tremendous physical intuition. But sometimes he would find a cute way of admitting that his previous thinking was not quite right, and that he also learned something from a debate. On this occasion it happened in the following manner.

After one of his rare trips to Eastern Europe (as far as I remember, it was Poland) Ya.B. gave me a gift. This was a poster showing a sophisticated, impressionist-style, lady. The fact that this was a poster with a sophisticated lady was not really surprising - you could expect this from Yakov Borisovich. What was surprising and flattering for me was his hand-written note at the bottom of the poster. In my translation from the Russian, it said “Thank you for your goal in my net”. Ya.B. was hinting at my passion for football, and he knew that this comparison would be appreciated much better than any other. So, this is how a great man admits a clarification of an error; he

simply says “thank you for your goal in my net”.

It was clear from the very beginning of the study of relic gravitational waves that the result of amplification of a wave-field should depend on the strength and time evolution of the gravitational pump field. We know little about the very early universe these days, even less was known at the beginning of the 70’s.

The best thing you can do is to consider plausible models. The simplest option is to assume [2] that the cosmological scale factor $a(\eta)$ in the expression

$$ds^2 = a^2(\eta)[-d\eta^2 + (\delta_{ij} + h_{ij})dx^i dx^j] \quad (1)$$

consists of pieces of power-law evolution:

$$a(\eta) = l_o |\eta|^{1+\beta}, \quad (2)$$

where l_o and β are constants. Then, the perturbed Einstein equations for $h_{ij}(\eta, \mathbf{x})$ simplify and can be solved in elementary functions. In particular, the intervals of power-law evolution (2) make tractable the effective ‘potential barrier’ a''/a in the gravitational wave (g.w.) equation [2]:

$$\mu'' + \mu \left[n^2 - \frac{a''}{a} \right] = 0, \quad (3)$$

where $' = d/d\eta = (a/c)d/dt$.

Using Eq.(2) and the unperturbed Einstein equations one can also find the effective equation of state for the ‘matter’, whatever it is, which drives the intervals of $a(\eta)$:

$$\frac{p}{\epsilon} = w = \frac{1 - \beta}{3(1 + \beta)}. \quad (4)$$

The somewhat strange form of the index $1 + \beta$ in Eq.(2) was motivated by a serious concern of that time - it was necessary to prove that even a small deviation from the exceptional law of evolution $a(\eta) \propto \eta$ guarantees the effect of g.w. amplification. It is only in this exceptional case that the effective potential a''/a vanishes, and therefore the superadiabatic coupling of gravitational waves to the nonstationary pump field $a(\eta)$ also vanishes. (The analogous effective potential is absent in equations for photons, massless neutrinos, and some massless scalar particles.)

The convenience of the notation utilized in Eq.(2) is that it parameterises the exceptional case by $\beta = 0$ and deviations from this case by a small β . Indeed, it was shown [2] that the amplitude of the generated g.w. mode is proportional to small β ; but it is not zero if $\beta \neq 0$. At the same time, if β is not especially small, the amplitude of the gravitational wave $h_p(n)$, soon after the beginning of the superadiabatic regime and while the wave is still in this regime, i.e. before any further processing of the amplitude, evaluates to

$$h_p(n) \approx \frac{l_{Pl}}{l_o} \left(\frac{n}{n_H} \right)^{2+\beta}. \quad (5)$$

Estimate (5) is approximate (we will be discussing more accurate formulas below) but it contains all the necessary physics. The underlying concepts of generation and detection of primordial gravitational waves have not changed since the first calculations [2, 3], and it is important for our further discussion to recall them again.

To begin with, we note that Eq.(5) is formulated for the dimensionless amplitude h of a given g.w. mode characterised by a constant dimensionless wavenumber n . (The $h(\eta)$ and $\mu(\eta)$ mode-functions are related by $h = \mu/a$.) The wavelength λ , measured in units of laboratory standards (as Zeldovich used to say, measured in centimeters), is related to n by $\lambda(\eta) = 2\pi a(\eta)/n$. It is convenient to use (and we will always do this) such an η -parameterisation of $a(\eta)$ that the present-day scale factor is $a(\eta_R) = 2l_H$, where $l_H = c/H(\eta_R)$ is the present-day value of the Hubble radius. Then, $n_H = 4\pi$ is the wavenumber of the waves whose wavelength today is equal the present-day Hubble radius. Longer waves have smaller n 's, and shorter waves have larger n 's.

Expression (5) is essentially a consequence of the following two assumptions. First, it is assumed that the mode under consideration has entered the superadiabatic regime in the past, and is still in this regime. This means that the mode's frequency, instead of being much larger than the characteristic frequency of the pump field, became comparable with it at some time in the past. Or, in cosmological context, the wavelength $\lambda(\eta)$ of the mode n , instead of being much shorter than the instantaneous Hubble radius $c/H(\eta) = a^2/a'$, became equal to it at some moment of time η_i , i.e. $\lambda_i = c/H_i$. For the scale factors of Eq.(2), this condition leads to $(n/n_H)|\eta_i| \approx 1$.

Second, we assume that by the beginning of the superadiabatic regime at $\eta = \eta_i$, the mode has still been in its vacuum state, rather than, say, in a

strongly excited (multi-particle) state. That is, in the language of classical physics, the mode's amplitude near η_i was not much larger than $h_i(n) \approx l_{Pl}/\lambda_i$, where l_{Pl} is the Planck length, $l_{Pl} = \sqrt{G\hbar/c^3}$. This condition on the amplitude follows from the requirement that initially there were only the zero-point quantum oscillations of the g.w. field, and the initial energy of the mode was $(1/2)\hbar\omega_i$. Because of the condition $\lambda_i = c/H_i$, we can also write $h_i(n)$ as $h_i(n) \approx H_i l_{Pl}/c$.

The amplitude of the mode, after the mode's entrance to the amplifying superadiabatic regime, and as long as this regime lasts, remains at the constant level $h_i(n)$, i.e. $h_p(n) \approx h_i(n)$. This holds true instead of the adiabatic decrease of the amplitude $\propto 1/a(\eta)$ that would be true in the adiabatic regime. In general, the quantity H_i is different for different n 's:

$$H_i \approx \frac{c}{l_o} \eta_i^{-(2+\beta)} \approx \frac{c}{l_o} \left(\frac{n}{n_H} \right)^{2+\beta}.$$

Therefore, a specific dependence on n arises in the function $h_i(n)$, and this is how one arrives at Eq.(5) in a simple qualitative manner.

Formula (5) gives the evaluation of the primordial (before further processing) g.w. spectrum $h_p(n)$. Roughly speaking, the initial vacuum spectrum $h_v(n) \propto n$ has been transformed into the primordial spectrum $h_p(n) \sim h_v(n)n^{1+\beta_i}$, where β_i characterizes the scale factor of the era when the transition from the adiabatic to superadiabatic regime has taken place for the given interval of wavenumbers n . However, the same mode n can sooner or later leave the amplifying regime and start oscillating again. Obviously, this reverse transition from superadiabatic to adiabatic regime is being described by the same theory.

The final amplitudes at some fixed moment of time (for example, today's amplitudes) $h_f(n)$ are related to the $h_p(n)$ -amplitudes by

$$h_f(n) \sim h_p(n)n^{-(1+\beta_f)},$$

where β_f characterizes the era when the opposite transition from the superadiabatic to adiabatic regime has taken place (this is why the minus sign arises in front of $1 + \beta_f$ in the exponent).

The discussed amplitudes $h(n)$ are in fact the root-mean-square (*rms*) amplitudes of the multi-mode field, they determine the mean-square value of

the wave field h according to the general formula

$$\langle h^2 \rangle = \int h_{rms}^2(n) \frac{dn}{n}.$$

It is necessary to say that in the beginning of the 80's, the inflationary cosmological scenario governed by a scalar field [4] was gaining popularity. Its central element is the interval of deSitter expansion, which corresponds to $\beta = -2$ in Eq.(2) (η grows from $-\infty$, $1 + \beta < 0$) and $w = -1$ in Eq.(4). By the time of publication of the inflationary scenario, unusual equations of state for ‘matter’ driving the very early Universe, including such exotic ones as $p = -\epsilon$, $w = -1$, had already been the subject of cosmological research, most notably in the work of A. D. Sakharov [5].

The g.w. calculations for the special case $\beta = -2$ were performed in a number of papers (see for example [6, 7, 8, 9]). If $\beta = -2$, the dependence on n vanishes in the general Eq.(5), and the primordial (unprocessed) spectrum $h_p(n)$ becomes ‘flat’ – that is, n -independent. Ironically, the prospects of direct detection of the stochastic g.w. background characterised by the corresponding processed (today’s) spectrum had already been explored by that time [3]; the processed spectral index for this model is $\alpha = 1$ in notations of that paper. Ref.[3] also suggested the use of cross-correlated data from two detectors and touched upon the technique of ‘drag-free satellites’ that was later developed in the Laser Interferometer Space Antenna (LISA).


The generality of inflationary, quasi-deSitter, solutions was a serious concern for Zeldovich during long time. He kept wondering about the sensitivity of inflationary solutions to the choice of initial conditions. Nobody would take the inflationary scenario seriously if it were a very contrived or unstable solution. However, it was shown [10] that the inflationary-type evolutions are, in fact, attractors in the space of all possible solutions of the corresponding dynamical system. This decisive property made inflationary evolutions more plausible and appealing.

2 Direct detection of relic gravitational waves

The spectrum of $h_{rms}(\nu)$ expected today is depicted in Fig.1 (for more details, see [11, 12]). Almost everything in this graph is the result of the processing of the primordial spectrum during the matter-dominated and radiation-dominated stages. The postulated ‘Zeldovich’s epoch’ governed by a very stiff

effective equation of state, is also present in the graph, as shown by some relative increase of power at very high frequencies. The primordial part of the spectrum survives only at frequencies below the present-day Hubble frequency $\nu_H \approx 2 \times 10^{-18}$ Hz. The available CMB observations determine the amplitude and spectral slope of the g.w. spectrum at frequencies around ν_H , and this defines the spectrum at higher frequencies.

Figure 1: Envelope of the $h_{rms}(\nu)$ spectrum for the case $\beta = -1.9$ ($n = 1.2$)



The numerical value of h_{rms} at frequencies around ν_H is determined by the numerical value of the observed quadrupole anisotropy of CMB. As will be shown in great detail in Sec.4, it follows from the theory of cosmological perturbations that relic gravitational waves should provide a significant fraction of the observed CMB signal at very large angular scales (barring the logical possibility that the observed anisotropies have nothing to do at all with cosmological perturbations of quantum-mechanical origin).

In other words, the final theoretical results do not contain any dimensionless parameter which could be regulated in such a manner as to make the contribution of, say, density perturbations to the quadrupole anisotropy several orders of magnitude larger than the contribution of gravitational waves. These contributions must be roughly equal, but the theory cannot exclude


that one of them will turn out to be a numerical factor 2-3 larger than another. Assuming that relic gravitational waves provide a half of the signal, one can find from the observed $\delta T/T \approx 10^{-5}$ that $h_{rms}(\nu_H) \approx 10^{-5}$ and, hence, it follows from Eq.(5) that $l_{Pl}/l_o \approx 10^{-5}$.

The slope of the primordial g.w. spectrum is also taken from CMB observations. The commonly used spectral index n (we denote it by a Roman letter n in order to distinguish from the wavenumber n) is related to the parameter β appearing in Eq.(5) by the relationship $n = 2\beta + 5$. The same relationship is valid for density perturbations, to be discussed later. The current observations [13, 14] give evidence for $n \approx 1$, which corresponds to $\beta \approx -2$. The particular graph in Fig. 1 is plotted for $\beta = -1.9$, $n = 1.2$, which tallies with the COBE data [15, 16]. (This spectral index $n > 1$ implies that $w < -1$, according to Eq.(4). It is not difficult to imagine that such an effective equation of state could hold in the very early Universe, if the recent supernovae observations hint at the validity of $w < -1$ even in the present-day Universe !) In simple words, the position and orientation of the entire piece-wise function $h(\nu)$ is defined by the known value of the function at the point $\nu = \nu_H$ and the known slope of the function in the vicinity of that point.

Incidentally, the initial quantum vacuum conditions for gravitational waves, at all frequencies shown in the graph, are formulated at the ‘initial’ moments of time, when each wavelength of interest was appreciably longer than the Planck length. Therefore, the shown results are immune to the short scale ambiguities of the so-called ‘trans-Planckian’ physics (see for example [17]). It is a different matter that at some frequencies the initial state is allowed to be a somewhat excited state, rather than the pure vacuum state, without running into a conflict with the adopted approximation of small perturbations. This exotic possibility and the corresponding modifications of the spectrum were discussed long time ago [18] (see also a related work [19]).

The graph in Fig.1 shows the piece-wise envelope of the today’s spectrum. The displayed result is quite approximate. In particular, it completely ignores the inevitable oscillations in the spectrum, whose origin goes back to the gradual diminishing (squeezing) of quantum-mechanical uncertainties in the phases of the emerging waves and the macroscopic manifestation of this effect in the form of the standing-wave pattern of the generated field. (This is also related to the concept of ‘particle pair creation’.) We will discuss these spectral oscillations below.

Figure 2: S3 LIGO noise curves and the expected sensitivity $\Omega_0 \sim 10^{-4}$ to stochastic gravitational waves



Nevertheless, the graph in Fig.1 is convenient in that it gives simple answers to the most general questions on the amplitudes and spectral slopes of relic gravitational waves in various frequency intervals. For example, it shows the expected amplitude $h_{rms} = 10^{-25}$ at $\nu = 10^2$ Hz. This is the level of the signal that we shall be dealing with in experimental programs. In terms of the parameter $\Omega_{gw}(\nu)$,


$$\Omega_{gw}(\nu) = \frac{\pi^2}{3} h^2(\nu) \left(\frac{\nu}{\nu_H} \right)^2,$$

it corresponds to $\Omega_{gw} \approx 10^{-10}$ at frequency $\nu = 10^2$ Hz and in its vicinity.

Where do we stand now in the attempt of direct detection of relic gravitational waves? The sensitivity of the presently operating ground-based interferometers is not good enough to reach the predicted level, but the experimenters are making a lot of progress. The data from the recently completed S3 run of LIGO [20] will probably allow one to reach the astrophysically interesting level of $\Omega_{gw} \sim 10^{-4}$, as shown in Fig. 2 (courtesy of J. Romano and the stochastic backgrounds group of LSC). Fortunately, the projected sensitivity of the advanced LIGO (~ 2011) will be sufficient to reach the re-

quired level of $h_{rms} \approx 10^{-25}$, $\Omega_{gw} \approx 10^{-10}$, when a month-long stretch of cross-correlated data from the two detectors is available.

Figure 3: Various LISA sources including relic gravitational waves



The ESA-NASA space-based mission LISA (~ 2013) will have a better chance to discover relic gravitational waves. Since the expected spectrum has larger amplitudes at lower frequencies, the detectability condition is potentially improving at lower frequencies. In Fig. 3 we show the LISA sensitivity in frequency bins of $\Delta f = 3 \times 10^{-8}$ Hz, which corresponds to an observation time of 1 year. This observation time should make it possible to resolve the g.w. lines from thousands of white dwarf binaries in our Galaxy, radiating at frequencies larger than 2×10^{-3} Hz. By removing the contribution of the binaries from the observed records, or by using sophisticated data analysis techniques without actually removing the contaminating signals from the data, one can effectively clean up the window of instrumental sensitivity at frequencies above 2×10^{-3} Hz. This window in the area of maximal sensitivity of LISA is shown in the graph together with the expected level of relic gravitational waves in that window.

3 Indirect detection of relic gravitational waves via CMB anisotropies and polarisation

The expected amplitudes of relic gravitational waves reach their highest level in the frequency interval of $10^{-18} - 10^{-16}$ Hz. This is why one has very good prospects for indirect detection of relic gravitational waves through the measurements of anisotropies in the distribution over the sky of the CMB temperature and polarisation. (For an introduction to the theoretical tools of CMB physics, see for example [21].)

The accurately calculated power spectrum $h_{rms}^2(n)$ is shown in Fig. 5 [22]. The spectrum is calculated at the moment of decoupling (recombination) of the CMB, with the redshift of decoupling at $z_{dec} = 1100$. The derivation of the spectrum takes into account the quantum-mechanical squeezing of the waves' phases, which manifests itself macroscopically in the standing-wave character of the generated gravitational waves. From the viewpoint of the underlying physics, it is this inevitable quantum-mechanical squeezing that is responsible for the oscillations in the power spectrum.

The displayed spectrum was obtained under the assumption that $\beta = -2$ ($n = 1$), i.e. for a flat primordial spectrum. The survived part of the primordial flat spectrum is seen on the graph as a horizontal part of the curve in the region of very small wavenumbers n . The normalisation of the spectrum is chosen in such a way that the induced quadrupole anisotropy of the CMB today is at the level of the actually observed quadrupole [15, 13]. Specifically, the temperature function $l(l+1)C_l$ in Fig. 4, calculated from the spectrum in Fig. 5, gives the required value of $960 (\mu K)^2$ at $l = 2$. The distribution of other induced multipoles is also shown in Fig. 4.

Figures 4 and 5 are placed one under another on purpose. This placement gives a better visual description of the fact noticed and explained previously [23]. Namely, the oscillations in the metric (gravitational field) power spectrum are entirely responsible for the oscillations in the angular power spectrum of the CMB temperature, with almost universal correspondence between extrema in the wavenumber space n and extrema in the multipole moment space l . If there is much/little power in the gravitational field perturbations of a given interval of wavelengths, one should expect much/little power in the temperature fluctuations at the corresponding angular scale.

It is the oscillations in the metric power spectrum that are responsible

for the oscillations in the l -space, and not the mysterious explanations often repeated in the literature, which claim that the peaks in the function $l(l+1)C_l$ arise because of some waves being caught (at the moment of decoupling) in their maxima or minima, while others are not. To illustrate the role of standing gravitational waves and the associated power spectrum oscillations, versus traveling gravitational waves with no power spectrum oscillations, it was explicitly shown [23] that the later hypothesis does not produce oscillations in the l -space.

Incidentally, it was argued [23] that in the case of density perturbations, the main contribution to the peaks in the temperature function $l(l+1)C_l$ can also be provided by oscillations in the metric power spectrum, rather than by the temperature variations accompanying sound waves in the photon-electron-baryon plasma at the last scattering surface. In the case of density perturbations, the metric power spectrum is mostly associated with the gravitational field of the dark matter, which dominates other matter components in terms of the gravitational field.

Oscillations in the metric power spectrum in the early Universe are inevitable, and for the same reason as in the g.w. case, namely, because of the standing-wave pattern of the metric perturbations that is related to their quantum-mechanical origin. Therefore, the often-discussed “acoustic” peaks in the l -space may well turn out to be “gravitational” peaks. It remains to be seen how this circumstance can change inferences about cosmological parameters.

We shall now turn to the CMB polarisation. (For some important papers on CMB polarisation, see for example [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30].) It follows from the radiation transfer equations that the polarisation of CMB is mainly determined by the first time-derivative of the metric perturbations in the interval of time when the polarisation is mainly produced. Therefore, it is the power spectrum of the function $h'_{ij}(\eta, \mathbf{x})$ that is of a primary importance. Since the g.w. field itself, including its normalisation, has been fully determined, the quantity of our interest is directly calculable. In Fig. 7 we show [22] the power spectrum $(h'/n)_{rms}^2(n)$, calculated at the time of decoupling. The induced E and B components of polarisation are shown in Fig. 6. This graph was derived under the usual assumptions about the recombination history, which means, in particular, that the polarisation was primarily accumulated during a relatively short interval of time around z_{dec} .

Similarly to the case of temperature anisotropies, the extrema in the

Figure 4: CMB temperature angular power spectrum




Figure 5: Power spectrum of gravitational waves at decoupling




Figure 6: Angular power spectrum for CMB polarisation






Figure 7: Power spectrum of first derivative of the g.w. metric



graphs of Fig. 7 and Fig. 6 are in a good correspondence with each other. If there is not much power in the first time-derivative of the metric, you should not expect much power in the polarisation at the corresponding angular scale. On the other hand, the region of wavenumbers $n \approx 90$, where there is the first pronounced peak in Fig. 7, is fully responsible for the first pronounced peak in Fig. 6 at the corresponding angular scales $l \approx 90$.

Figure 8: Expected numerical level of anisotropy and polarisation induced by relic gravitational waves



In Fig. 8 we combine together some of the expected signals from relic gravitational waves. They are encoded in the CMB anisotropies and polarisation. This figure includes also a possible polarisation bump, discussed previously by other authors, at very small l 's. This feature arises because of the extended reionisation period in the relatively late universe, around $z_{rei} \approx 17$. In agreement with the explanations given above, the amplitude and position of this bump in the l -space are determined by the amplitude and position of the first maximum in the power spectrum $(h'/n)^2$ of the function $h'_{ij}(\eta, \mathbf{x})$, calculated at z_{rei} .

The resulting graphs in Fig. 6 and Fig. 8 are qualitatively similar to the graphs derived by other authors before us. However, we take the re-

sponsibility of claiming that the numerical level of, say, the B component of polarisation shown in our graphs is what the observers should expect to see on the sky. Of course, this statement assumes that the observed large-scale anisotropies of CMB are caused by cosmological perturbations of quantum-mechanical origin, and not by something else.

The true level of the B signal can be somewhat higher or somewhat lower than the theoretical level shown in our figures. But the signal cannot be, say, several orders of magnitude lower than the one shown on our graphs. In contrast, the inflationary literature claims that the amount of “inflationary gravitational waves” vanishes in the limit of the flat primordial spectrum $\beta = -2$ ($n = 1$). Therefore, the most likely level of the B mode signal produced by “inflationary gravitational waves” is close to zero. This would make the detection impossible in any foreseeable future. It is a pity that many of our experimental colleagues, being guided by the wrong theory, are accepting their defeat even before having started to build instruments aimed at detecting relic gravitational waves via the B component of polarisation.

Their logic seems to be the following: ‘we would love to discover the fundamentally important relic gravitational waves, but we were told by inflationists many times that this is very unlikely to happen, so we agreed to feel satisfied even if we succeed only in putting some limits on, say, polarisation properties of dust in the surrounding cosmos’. The author of this contribution fears that in a complex experiment like the B -mode detection, this kind of logic can only lead to overlooking the important signal that the experiment originally targeted.

Concluding this section I would like to say as a witness that Zeldovich suggested using the CMB polarisation as a g.w. discriminator, as early as in the very beginning of the 80’s. This was clearly stated in private conversations, but I am not aware of any written records.

4 The false “standard inflationary result”. How to correctly quantise a cosmological harmonic oscillator

Why bother about relic gravitational waves if inflationists claim that the amount of relic gravitational waves (inflationists and followers call them “in-

flationary gravitational waves”) should be zero or almost zero? This claim is a direct consequence of the so-called “standard inflationary result”, which is the main contribution of inflationary theorists to the subject of practical, rather than imaginary, cosmology.

In the inflationary scenario, the ‘initial’ era of the universe expansion is driven by a scalar field φ with the scalar field potential $V(\varphi)$. It is in this era that the initial quantum vacuum conditions for cosmological perturbations are being formulated. The inflationary solutions for the scale factor $a(\eta)$ are close to the deSitter evolution characterised by $\beta = -2$ in Eq.(2). The effective equation of state for the scalar field is always $\epsilon + p \geq 0$, so that for the power-law intervals of expansion driven by the scalar field, the parameter β can only be $\beta \leq -2$, see Eq.(4). Therefore, one expects the primordial spectrum of the generated metric perturbations to be almost flat, i.e. the primordial spectral index n should be close to $n = 1$, with $n \leq 1$.

The beginning of the amplifying superadiabatic regime for the given mode of perturbations is often called the ‘first Hubble radius crossing’, while the end of this regime for the given mode is often called the ‘second Hubble radius crossing’. The “standard inflationary result” is formulated for cosmological perturbations called density perturbations (scalar, S , perturbations) as opposed to the gravitational waves (tensor, T , perturbations) considered in Sec. 1.

The “standard inflationary result” states that the final (second crossing, $\bar{f}$) amplitudes of quantities describing density perturbations are related to the initial (first crossing, i) values of φ and other quantities, according to the evaluation:

$$\left(\frac{\delta\rho}{\rho}\right)_{\bar{f}} \sim (h_S)_{\bar{f}} \sim (\zeta)_{\bar{f}} \approx (\zeta)_i \sim \left(\frac{H^2}{\dot{\varphi}}\right)_i \sim \left(\frac{V^{3/2}}{V_{,\varphi}}\right)_i \sim \frac{H_i}{\sqrt{1-n}}. \quad (6)$$

The numerator of the last term on the r.h.s. of Eq.(6) is the value of the Hubble parameter taken at the moment of time when the given mode enters the superadiabatic regime. This is the same quantity H_i which defines the g.w. (‘tensor’) metric amplitude, as described in Sec. 1. Since we are supposed to start with the initial vacuum quantum state for all cosmological perturbations, one would expect that the results for density perturbations should be similar to the results for gravitational waves. One would expect that the amplitude h_S of the generated ‘scalar’ metric perturbations should

be finite and small, and of the same order of magnitude as the amplitude h_T of ‘tensor’ metric perturbations.

However, according to the “standard inflationary result”, this is very far from being the case. The denominator of the last term of Eq.(6) contains a new factor: $\sqrt{1-n}$. This factor goes to zero in the limit of the most interesting and observationally preferred possibility of the flat (Harrison-Zeldovich-Peebles) primordial spectrum $n = 1$. Correspondingly, the amplitudes of the generated density perturbations go to infinity, according to the prediction of inflationary theorists, in the limit of the flat spectrum. (By now, the “standard inflationary result” (6) has been cited, used, praised, reformulated, popularised, etc. in hundreds of inflationary publications, so it has become ‘accepted by way of repetition’.)

As will be demonstrated below, the divergence in Eq.(6) is not a violation, suddenly descending upon us from the ‘blue sky’, of the adopted approximation of small linear perturbations. This is a manifestation of the incorrect theory. Even if the spectral index n is not very close to 1, and you combine n with a reasonable H_i in order to obtain, for example, a small number 10^{-5} for the r.h.s. of Eq.(6), this will not make your theory correct. This will be just an acceptable number accidentally following from the wrong formula. You will have to pay a heavy price in some other places.

An attempt to derive physical conclusions from this formula can only lead to mistakes. The current literature is full of incorrect far-reaching physical conclusions derived from this wrong theory. This is a kind of situation which L. D. Landau used to describe sarcastically in the following words: “If you assume that the derivative of the function $\sin x$ is $\ln x$, rather than $\cos x$, you can make many wonderful discoveries...”.

In inflationary literature, the ‘zero in the denominator’ factor $\sqrt{1-n}$ appears in many different dresses. It is often written in equivalent forms, such as $(\dot{\varphi}/H)_i$, $(V_{,\varphi}/V)_i$, $(H_{,\varphi}/H)_i$, $\sqrt{1+w_i}$, etc. Inflationists are routinely hiding their absurd prediction of infinitely large amplitudes of density perturbations that should take place in the limit of the flat spectrum $n \rightarrow 1$. They divide the g.w. amplitude h_T over the predicted divergent amplitude h_S . This division produces the so-called ‘tensor-to-scalar ratio’, or ‘consistency relation’: $h_T/h_S \approx \sqrt{1-n}$. The quantity H_i , common for the T and S perturbations, cancels out in the composed ratio, and the ‘zero in the denominator’ factor is transferred to the numerator of the final expression. It is then declared that the metric amplitude h_S of density perturbations is de-

terminated by the observed CMB anisotropies, and, therefore, the inflationary ‘consistency relation’ demands that the g.w. amplitude h_T must vanish in the limit of $n \rightarrow 1$.

In other words, instead of being horrified by the fact that their theory predicts arbitrarily large amplitudes of density perturbations (and, hence, the theory is in complete disagreement with observations, because the analysis of the data shows no catastrophic increase in the amplitude when the tested spectral index approaches $n = 1$), supporters of the inflationary approach to science systematically claim that their theory is in ‘spectacular agreement’ with observations, and it is gravitational waves that should vanish.

If this were true, there would not be much sense in attempting to detect primordial gravitational waves, as the observations persistently point toward $n \approx 1$, including $n = 1$. It is quite common to hear these days enthusiastic promises of inflationary believers to detect “inflationary gravitational waves” in the “not-so-distant future” via the measurement of B -mode polarisation of CMB. But from other papers of the same authors it follows that there is no reason even to try. If you trust and cite inflationary formulas, the expected amount of “inflationary gravitational waves” should be very small or zero. You can only hope to be extremely lucky if you suggest to detect them, even in the quite distant future, for example with the proposed mission called Big Bang Observer. And nobody should be surprised if you have found nothing, because $n = 1$ is in the heart of all claims, theoretical and observational. Moreover, most loyal inflationists would say that this was exactly what they had always been predicting.

To demonstrate the incorrectness of inflationary conclusions, we shall now concentrate on the ‘zero in the denominator’ factor. We will have to recall the quantisation procedure for gravitational waves and density perturbations. It is necessary to remind the reader that some inflationists and their supporters insisted for many years on the claim that the dramatic difference in the final numerical values of h_T and h_S arises not because of the initial conditions, but because of the subsequent evolution.

Specifically, they claimed that the classical long-wavelength ‘scalar’ metric perturbations are capable of experiencing, in contrast to gravitational waves, a “big amplification during reheating”. (For a critical discussion, see [31].) But it now looks as if the fallacy of this proposition has become clear even to its most ardent proponents. Therefore, we shall now focus on the issue of quantum mechanics and initial conditions.

The perturbed gravitational field for all three sorts of cosmological perturbations (scalar, vector, tensor) is described by Eq.(1). For simplicity, we are considering spatially flat cosmologies, whose spatial curvature radius is infinite. However, if the spatial curvature radius is finite but, say, only a factor of 10 longer than l_H , very little will change in our analysis.

The metric perturbations $h_{ij}(\eta, \mathbf{x})$ can be expanded over spatial Fourier harmonics labeled by the wavevector $\mathbf{n}$:

$$h_{ij}(\eta, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathcal{C}}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^3\mathbf{n} \sum_{s=1,2} \hat{p}_{ij}^s(\mathbf{n}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \left[\hat{h}_n^s(\eta) e^{i\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{n}}^s + \hat{h}_n^{s*}(\eta) e^{-i\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{n}}^{s\dagger} \right]. \quad (7)$$

The three sorts of cosmological perturbations are different in that they have three different sorts of polarisation tensors $\hat{p}_{ij}^s(\mathbf{n})$, and each of them has two different polarisation states $s = 1, 2$. The ‘scalar’ and ‘vector’ metric perturbations are always accompanied by perturbations in density and/or velocity of matter. The normalisation constant $\mathcal{C}$ is determined by quantum mechanics, and the derivation of its value is one of the aims of our discussion.

Let us recall the procedure of quantisation of gravitational waves. Let us consider an individual g.w. mode $\mathbf{n}$. The time-dependent mode functions $\hat{h}_n^s(\eta)$ can be written as

$$\hat{h}_n^s(\eta) = \frac{1}{a(\eta)} \mu_n^s(\eta). \quad (8)$$

For each s and $\mathbf{n}$, the g.w. mode functions $\mu(\eta)$ satisfy the familiar equation (3).

The action for each mode has the form

$$S = \int L d\eta, \quad (9)$$

where the g.w. Lagrangian L is given by the expression [32]

$$L_{gw} = \frac{1}{2c\kappa} n^{-3} a^2 \left[\left(\frac{\mu}{a} \right)'^2 - n^2 \left(\frac{\mu}{a} \right)^2 \right], \quad (10)$$

and

$$\kappa = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4}.$$

The Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial h} - \frac{d}{d\eta} \frac{\partial L}{\partial h'} = 0$$

for the dimensionless g.w. variable $h = \mu/a$ brings us to the equation of motion

$$h'' + 2\frac{a'}{a}h' + n^2h = 0, \quad (11)$$

which is equivalent to Eq.(3).

In order to move from 3-dimensional Fourier components to the usual description in terms of an individual oscillator with frequency n , we will be working with the quantity $\bar{h}$ introduced according to the definition

$$\bar{h} = \frac{a_0}{n\sqrt{c\kappa}}h = \frac{\sqrt{\hbar}a_0}{\sqrt{8\pi}l_{Pl}n}h = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{32\pi^3} \frac{\lambda_0}{l_{Pl}}}h, \quad (12)$$

where a_0 is a constant. This constant a_0 is the value of the scale factor $a(\eta)$ at some instant of time $\eta = \eta_0$ where the initial conditions are being formulated, and $\lambda_0 = 2\pi a_0/n$.

In terms of $\bar{h}$, the Lagrangian (10) takes the form

$$L_{gw} = \frac{1}{2n} \left(\frac{a}{a_0} \right)^2 \left[(\bar{h}')^2 - n^2 \bar{h}^2 \right]. \quad (13)$$

The quantity $\bar{h} = q$ is the ‘position’ variable, while the canonically conjugate ‘momentum’ variable p is

$$p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \bar{h}'} = \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{a}{a_0} \right)^2 \bar{h}'. \quad (14)$$

In the distant past, at times near η_0 , and before η_i when a given mode entered superadiabatic regime, the g.w. amplitude behaved according to the law

$$h(\eta) \propto \frac{1}{a(\eta)} e^{-in(\eta-\eta_0)}.$$

The time-derivative of $a(\eta)$ can be neglected, i.e. $a'/a \ll n$. Then, we promote q and p to the status of quantum-mechanical operators, denote them by bold-face letters, and write down their asymptotic expressions:

$$\mathbf{q} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2}} \frac{a_0}{a} \left[\mathbf{c} e^{-in(\eta-\eta_0)} + \mathbf{c}^\dagger e^{in(\eta-\eta_0)} \right], \quad (15)$$

$$\mathbf{p} = i\sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2}} \frac{a}{a_0} \left[-\mathbf{c} e^{-in(\eta-\eta_0)} + \mathbf{c}^\dagger e^{in(\eta-\eta_0)} \right]. \quad (16)$$

The commutation relationships for the $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}$ operators, and for the annihilation and creation operators $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}^\dagger$, are given by

$$[\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}] = i\hbar, \quad [\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}^\dagger] = 1.$$

The initial vacuum state $|0\rangle$ is defined by the condition

$$\mathbf{c}|0\rangle = 0.$$

This is indeed a genuine vacuum state of a simple harmonic oscillator, which gives at $\eta = \eta_0$ the following relationships

$$\langle 0|\mathbf{q}^2|0\rangle = \langle 0|\mathbf{p}^2|0\rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2}, \quad \Delta\mathbf{q}\Delta\mathbf{p} = \frac{\hbar}{2}.$$

The root-mean-square value of $\mathbf{q}$ in the vacuum state is $q_{rms} = \sqrt{\hbar/2}$. Combining this number with the definition (12) we derive

$$h_{rms} = \left(\langle 0|\mathbf{h}^2|0\rangle \right)^{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{2}(2\pi)^{3/2}l_{Pl}}{\lambda_0}. \quad (17)$$

Extrapolating the initial time η_0 up to the boundary between the adiabatic and superadiabatic regimes at $\eta = \eta_i$, we derive the estimate $h_{rms} \sim l_{Pl}/\lambda_i$. It is this evaluation that was used in [2] and in Sec. 1. More accurate calculations along these lines produce $\mathcal{C} = \sqrt{16\pi}l_{Pl}$ in expression (7) for gravitational waves.

A consistent formal derivation of the total Hamiltonian, including the terms describing interaction of the oscillator with external field, is presented in Ref.[34] by equations (19)-(24) there. Technically, the derivation is based on the canonical pair $q = \mu$, $p = \partial L/\partial \mu'$. The Hamiltonian associated with the Lagrangian (13) has the form

$$\mathbf{H}(\eta) = n\mathbf{c}^\dagger \mathbf{c} + \sigma \mathbf{c}^{\dagger 2} + \sigma^* \mathbf{c}^2, \quad (18)$$

where the coupling to the external field is given by the function $\sigma(\eta) = (i/2)(a'/a)$. In the same Ref.[34] one can also find the Heisenberg equations of motion for the Heisenberg operators $\mathbf{c}(\eta)$, $\mathbf{c}^\dagger(\eta)$, and their connection

to classical equation (3). The asymptotic expressions for the Heisenberg operators,

$$\mathbf{c}(\eta) = \mathbf{c}e^{-in(\eta-\eta_0)}, \quad \mathbf{c}^\dagger(\eta) = \mathbf{c}^\dagger e^{in(\eta-\eta_0)},$$

enter into formulas (15), (16). Clearly, the vacuum state $|0\rangle$, defined as $\mathbf{c}(\eta)|0\rangle = 0$, minimises the oscillator's energy (18).

A rigorous quantum-mechanical Schrodinger evolution of the initial vacuum state of cosmological perturbations transforms this state into a strongly squeezed (multi-particle) vacuum state [32], but we focus here only on the initial quantum state, which defines the quantum-mechanical normalisation of our classical mode functions.

We shall now switch to density perturbations.

For each mode $\mathbf{n}$ of density perturbations (S-perturbations), the mode's metric components h_{ij} entering Eq.(1) can be written as

$$h_{ij} = h(\eta)Q\delta_{ij} + h_l(\eta)n^{-2}Q_{,ij},$$

where the spatial eigen-functions Q are $Q = e^{\pm i\mathbf{n}\cdot\mathbf{x}}$. Therefore, the metric components associated with density perturbations are characterised by two polarisation amplitudes: $h(\eta)$ and $h_l(\eta)$. If the initial era is driven by an arbitrary scalar field φ , there appears a third unknown function - the amplitude $\varphi_1(\eta)$ of the scalar field perturbation:

$$\varphi = \varphi_0(\eta) + \varphi_1(\eta)Q.$$

One often considers the so-called minimally coupled to gravity scalar field φ , with the energy-momentum tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \varphi_{,\mu}\varphi_{,\nu} - g_{\mu\nu} \left[\frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta}\varphi_{,\alpha}\varphi_{,\beta} + V(\varphi) \right].$$

The coupling of scalar fields to gravity is still a matter of ambiguity, and the very possibility of quantum-mechanical generation of density perturbations relies on an extra hypothesis, but we suppose that we were lucky and the coupling was such as we need. The three unknown functions $h(\eta)$, $h_l(\eta)$, $\varphi_1(\eta)$ should be found from the perturbed Einstein equations augmented by the appropriate initial conditions dictated by quantum mechanics.

It is important to note that inflationary theorists are still struggling with the basic equations for density perturbations. In inflationary papers, you will often see equations containing complicated combinations of metric perturbations mixed up with the unperturbed and/or perturbed functions of the scalar field φ and $V(\varphi)$.

Inflationists are still engaged in endless discussions on the shape of the scalar field potential $V(\varphi)$ and what it could mean for countless inflationary models. However, this state of affairs is simply a reflection of the fact that the equations have not been properly transformed and simplified. Since the underlying physics is the interaction of a cosmological harmonic oscillator with the gravitational pump field, mathematically the equations should reveal this themselves. And indeed they do.

It was shown in paper [33] that, for any potential $V(\varphi)$, there exists only one second-order differential equation to be solved:

$$\mu'' + \mu \left[n^2 - \frac{(a\sqrt{\gamma})''}{a\sqrt{\gamma}} \right] = 0, \quad (19)$$

where the function $\mu(\eta)$ represents the single dynamical degree of freedom, describing S-perturbations. The effective potential barrier $(a\sqrt{\gamma})''/(a\sqrt{\gamma})$ depends only on $a(\eta)$ and its derivatives, in full analogy with the g.w. oscillator, Eq.(3). The time-dependent function γ ($\gamma(\eta)$ or $\gamma(t)$) is defined by

$$\gamma = 1 + \left(\frac{a}{a'} \right)' = -\frac{c}{a} \frac{H'}{H^2} = -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}.$$

As soon as the appropriate solution for $\mu(\eta)$ is found, all three functions describing density perturbations are easily calculable:

$$\begin{aligned} h(\eta) &= \frac{1}{c} H(\eta) \left[\int_{\eta_0}^{\eta} \mu \sqrt{\gamma} d\eta + C_i \right], \\ h_l'(\eta) &= \frac{a}{a'} \left[h'' - \frac{H''}{H'} h' + n^2 h \right], \\ \varphi_1(\eta) &= \frac{\sqrt{\gamma}}{\sqrt{2\kappa}} \left[\frac{\mu}{a\sqrt{\gamma}} - h \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The constant C_i reflects the remaining coordinate freedom within the class of synchronous coordinate systems. (Another constant comes out from the

integration of the above-given equation for h_l' .) The function μ does not depend on this remaining coordinate freedom, and the constant C_i cancels out in the expression defining $\mu(\eta)$ in terms of $h(\eta)$:

$$\frac{\mu}{a\sqrt{\gamma}} = h - \frac{H}{H'}h'.$$

The function $\mu/a\sqrt{\gamma}$ is that part of the scalar metric amplitude $h(\eta)$ which does not depend on the remaining coordinate freedom ('gauge-invariant' metric perturbation).

In the short-wavelength regime, the function μ describing density perturbations behaves as $\mu \propto e^{-in\eta}$. This is the same behaviour as in the case of the function μ describing gravitational waves. This similarity between the respective functions μ (μ_T and μ_S) is valid only in the sense of their asymptotic η -time dependence, but not in the sense of their overall numerical normalisation (see below).

In the long-wavelength regime, the dominant solution to Eq.(19) is $\mu \propto a\sqrt{\gamma}$. The quantity which remains constant in this regime is $\mu/a\sqrt{\gamma}$. It is this physically relevant variable that takes over from the analogous variable $h = \mu/a$ in the g.w. problem. We introduce the notation

$$\frac{\mu}{a\sqrt{\gamma}} = \zeta, \tag{20}$$

where μ satisfies Eq.(19).

To make contact with earlier work, it should be mentioned that the previously introduced quantity

$$\zeta_{BST} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{(a/a')\Phi' + \Phi}{1+w} + \Phi,$$

where Φ is Bardeen's potential and BST stands for Bardeen, Steinhardt, Turner [35], can be reduced to our variable ζ (20) up to the numerical coefficient $-(1/2)$. Our quantity μ for density perturbations can also be related to the variable u_{CLMS} , where $CLMS$ stands for Chibisov, Lukash, Mukhanov, Sasaki [36, 37, 38].

In preparation for quantisation, we should first identify the inflationary 'zero in the denominator' factor. The unperturbed Einstein equations for the

coupled system of gravitational and scalar fields require [33]

$$\kappa (\varphi_0')^2 = 2 \left(\frac{a'}{a} \right)^2 \gamma.$$

Therefore, the ‘zero in the denominator’ factor

$$\left(\frac{\dot{\varphi}_0}{H} \right)_i = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}} (\sqrt{\gamma})_i$$

is expressed in the form of very small values of the dimensionless function $\sqrt{\gamma}$.

Within the approximation of power-law scale factors (2), the function γ reduces to a set of constants,

$$\gamma = \frac{2 + \beta}{1 + \beta}, \quad 1 + w = \frac{2}{3} \gamma.$$

The constant γ degenerates to zero in the limit of the evolution law with $\beta = -2$; that is, in the limit of the gravitational pump field which is responsible for the generation of primordial cosmological perturbations with flat spectrum $n = 1$. So, we are especially interested in the very small values of $\sqrt{\gamma}$.

It was shown [33] that the dynamical problem for the scalar-field-driven S-perturbations can be obtained from the dynamical problem for gravitational waves by simple substitutions: $a(\eta) \rightarrow a(\eta)\sqrt{\gamma(\eta)}$, $\mu_T(\eta) \rightarrow \mu_S(\eta)$. (This is not a conjecture, but this is a rule whose validity was established after a thorough analysis of these two problems separately.) Each of these substitutions is valid up to an arbitrary constant factor. Using these substitutions, one obtains the S-equation (19) from the T-equation (3), and one obtains the physically relevant variable $\zeta = \mu_S/a\sqrt{\gamma}$ for S-perturbations from the g.w. variable $h = \mu_T/a$.

Moving from the 3-dimensional Fourier components of the field ζ to an individual oscillator with frequency n , we introduce the quantity $\bar{\zeta}$ according to the same rule (12) that was used when we introduced $\bar{h}$. Namely, we introduce

$$\bar{\zeta} = \frac{a_0}{n\sqrt{c\kappa}}\zeta = \frac{\sqrt{\hbar}a_0}{\sqrt{8\pi}l_{Pl}n}\zeta = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{32\pi^3}} \frac{\lambda_0}{l_{Pl}}\zeta. \quad (21)$$

The application of the substitutions $a \rightarrow \tilde{a} = a\sqrt{\gamma}$, $\bar{h} \rightarrow \bar{\zeta}$ to the g.w. Lagrangian (13) gives rise to the Lagrangian L_{dp} for the single dynamical degree of freedom describing S-perturbations:

$$L_{dp} = \frac{1}{2n} \left(\frac{a\sqrt{\gamma}}{a_0\sqrt{\gamma_0}} \right)^2 \left[(\bar{\zeta}')^2 - n^2 \bar{\zeta}^2 \right]. \quad (22)$$

Obviously, the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\zeta'' + 2 \frac{(a\sqrt{\gamma})'}{a\sqrt{\gamma}}, \zeta' + n^2 \zeta = 0 \quad (23)$$

derivable from the lagrangian (22) in terms of the independent variable ζ , is equivalent to Eq.(19) which is the Euler-Lagrange equation derivable from the Lagrangian (22) in terms of the independent variable μ_S . The Lagrangian (22) should be used for quantisation. The Lagrangian itself, as well as the action and the Hamiltonian, does not degenerate in the limit $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, i.e., in the limit of the most interesting background gravitational field in the form of the de-Sitter metric, $\gamma = 0$.

We shall start with the analysis of the paper [39] which, together with Ref.[40], is sometimes referred to as the most recent work that contains a rigorous mathematical derivation of the “standard inflationary result”. The author of these papers uses slightly different notations, such as $a^2 = e^{2\rho}$ and $\varphi = \phi$. In his notation, the quantity $\dot{\varphi}_0/H$ is $\dot{\phi}/\dot{\rho}$, so that the ‘zero in the denominator’ factor appears as $\dot{\phi}_*/\dot{\rho}_*$, where the asterisk means “the time of horizon crossing”.

As a “useful example to keep in mind” for quantisation of density perturbations, the author suggests the artificial model of a test massless scalar field f in deSitter space. But the Lagrangian, classical solutions, and quantisation procedure for f are identical to the g.w. case that we recalled above, so that his variable f is our h for gravitational waves. His Lagrangian (2.12) for density perturbations coincides in structure with our Lagrangian (22), and we discuss one and the same observable quantity ζ .

It is worthwhile to quote explicitly the attempted rigorous proof [39]: “Since the action (2.12) also contains a factor $\dot{\phi}/\dot{\rho}$ we also have to set its value to the value at horizon crossing, this factor only appears in normalizing the classical solution. In other words, near horizon crossing we set

$$f = \frac{\dot{\phi}}{\dot{\rho}} \zeta,$$

where f is a canonically normalized field in de-Sitter space. This produces the well known result...”. And the author immediately writes down the square of the “standard inflationary result”, with the square of the factor $\dot{\phi}_*/\dot{\rho}_*$ in the denominator of the final expression.

Let us try to traverse in practice the path to the “well known result”. (To be fair to the author, the derivation of the “standard inflationary result” does not appear to be the main purpose of his paper [39], so my criticism does not imply anything about other statements of that paper.) The factor $\dot{\phi}/\dot{\rho}$ in (2.12) of the cited paper is our factor $\sqrt{\gamma}$ in Eq.(22). It is recommended [39] to combine the results for the g.w. variable h with the prescription $\zeta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}h$. So, instead of Eq.(15), we would have to write

$$\mathbf{q} = \bar{\zeta} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2}} \frac{\tilde{a}_0}{\tilde{a}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \left[\mathbf{b} e^{-in(\eta-\eta_0)} + \mathbf{b}^\dagger e^{in(\eta-\eta_0)} \right]. \quad (24)$$

The canonically conjugate momentum seems to be

$$p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \bar{\zeta}'} = \frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{\tilde{a}}{\tilde{a}_0} \right)^2 \gamma \bar{\zeta}'. \quad (25)$$

The time derivative of γ should be neglected, as γ is either a constant or a slowly changing function at times near η_0 . Therefore, we would have to write, instead of Eq.(16), the following relationship:

$$\mathbf{p} = i \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2}} \frac{\tilde{a}}{\tilde{a}_0} \sqrt{\gamma} \left[-\mathbf{b} e^{-in(\eta-\eta_0)} + \mathbf{b}^\dagger e^{in(\eta-\eta_0)} \right]. \quad (26)$$

The commutation relations are given by

$$[\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}] = i\hbar, \quad [\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}^\dagger] = 1.$$

One is encouraged and tempted to think that the quantum state $|0_s\rangle$, annihilated by $\mathbf{b}$, namely

$$\mathbf{b}|0_s\rangle = 0,$$

is the vacuum state of the field ζ , i.e., the ground state of the Hamiltonian associated with the Lagrangian (22). The calculation of the mean square value of $\bar{\zeta}$ at $\eta = \eta_0$ produces the result

$$\langle 0_s | \mathbf{q}^2 | 0_s \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2} \frac{1}{\gamma_0},$$

in which the ‘zero in the denominator’ factor $\sqrt{\gamma}$ is manifestly present and squared, as the “well known result” prescribes.

In the limit of very small $\sqrt{\gamma}$ one obtains the divergence of initial amplitudes, which is in the heart of all inflationary predictions. (In the published version [40] of the e-paper [39], the road to the “well known result” recommends, possibly due to a misprint, the diametrically opposite prescription

$$\zeta = \frac{\dot{\phi}}{\dot{\rho}} f,$$

which would send the factor γ to the numerator of the above calculation. It looks as though the ‘rigorous’ inflationary predictions fluctuate between zero and infinity.)

In inflationary literature, the power spectrum $P_{\mathcal{R}}(k)$ of curvature perturbations is usually written in the form

$$P_{\mathcal{R}}(k) = \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} \frac{|u_k|^2}{z^2},$$

where

$$z = a \frac{\dot{\phi}}{H} = a \sqrt{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}},$$

and u_k are the mode-functions ($u_k = \mu_n$ in our notations) satisfying Eq.(19) with the initial conditions

$$u_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}} e^{-ik\eta} \quad \text{for} \quad \eta \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (27)$$

As one can see from the expression for $P_{\mathcal{R}}(k)$, in inflationary theory, which is based on the initial conditions (27), the divergence of $P_{\mathcal{R}}(k)$ in the limit of very small $\sqrt{\gamma}$ is present from the very beginning of the evolution of the perturbations. To put it differently, the divergence takes place from the very early high-frequency regime, where by the physical meaning of the problem we were supposed to choose a minimal amplitude of the ‘gauge-invariant’ metric perturbation ζ (or, in other words, a minimal amplitude of the curvature perturbation ζ).

The crucial point of our discussion is that the temptation to interpret $|0_s\rangle$ as the vacuum state for the field ζ is, in fact, a grave error. The calculation

of the mean-square value of the canonically conjugate momentum $\mathbf{p}$ gives

$$\langle 0_s | \mathbf{p}^2 | 0_s \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2} \gamma_0,$$

so that the factor $\sqrt{\gamma}$ cancels out in the uncertainty relation

$$\Delta \mathbf{q} \Delta \mathbf{p} = \frac{\hbar}{2}.$$

The derived numbers clearly indicate that the quantum state $|0_s\rangle$ is not a genuine (ordinary) vacuum state $|0\rangle$ for the dynamical variable ζ , but, on the contrary, is a multi-particle (squeezed vacuum) state. This is why we have used the subindex s .

To show how the states $|0\rangle$ and $|0_s\rangle$ are related, we shall first transform the operators. Let us introduce the annihilation and creation operators $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}^\dagger$ according to the Bogoliubov transformation

$$\mathbf{b} = u\mathbf{c} + v\mathbf{c}^\dagger, \quad \mathbf{b}^\dagger = u^*\mathbf{c}^\dagger + v^*\mathbf{c}, \quad (28)$$

where

$$u = \cosh r, \quad v = e^{i2\phi} \sinh r. \quad (29)$$

The parameters r and ϕ are called squeeze parameters.

Let us assign the following values to r and ϕ :

$$e^{2r} = \gamma, \quad \phi = n(\eta - \eta_0) \quad \text{or} \quad e^{-2r} = \gamma, \quad \phi = n(\eta - \eta_0) + \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad (30)$$

We shall now use the substitution (28), together with Eqns (29) and (30), to Eqns (24) and (26). The factor $1/\sqrt{\gamma}$ cancels out in Eq.(24) and the factor $\sqrt{\gamma}$ cancels out in Eq.(26). In terms of $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}^\dagger$, the operators $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}$ will take the final form:

$$\mathbf{q} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2}} \frac{\tilde{a}_0}{\tilde{a}} \left[\mathbf{c} e^{-in(\eta - \eta_0)} + \mathbf{c}^\dagger e^{in(\eta - \eta_0)} \right], \quad (31)$$

$$\mathbf{p} = i \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2}} \frac{\tilde{a}}{\tilde{a}_0} \left[-\mathbf{c} e^{-in(\eta - \eta_0)} + \mathbf{c}^\dagger e^{in(\eta - \eta_0)} \right]. \quad (32)$$

The genuine vacuum state for the variable ζ (i.e. the ground state of the corresponding Hamiltonian) is defined by the condition

$$\mathbf{c}|0\rangle = 0.$$

Calculating the mean square values of $\mathbf{q}$ and its canonically conjugate momentum $\mathbf{p}$, we find

$$\langle 0|\mathbf{q}^2|0\rangle = \langle 0|\mathbf{p}^2|0\rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2}, \quad \Delta\mathbf{q}\Delta\mathbf{p} = \frac{\hbar}{2},$$

as it should be.

Taking into account the definition (21), we finally derive the initial *rms* value of the variable $\zeta = \mu/a\sqrt{\gamma}$:

$$\zeta_{rms} = \left(\langle 0|\zeta^2|0\rangle\right)^{1/2} = \frac{\sqrt{2}(2\pi)^{3/2}l_{Pl}}{\lambda_0}. \quad (33)$$

Extrapolating the initial time η_0 up to the boundary between the adiabatic and superadiabatic regimes at $\eta = \eta_i$, we arrive at the estimate

$$\left(\frac{\mu}{a\sqrt{\gamma}}\right)_{rms} \sim \frac{l_{Pl}}{\lambda_i}.$$

This evaluation, plus the constancy of the quantity $\mu/a\sqrt{\gamma}$ throughout the long-wavelength regime, is the foundation of the result according to which the final (at the end of the long-wavelength regime) amplitudes of gravitational waves and density perturbations should be roughly equal to each other [33].

There is no dimensional parameter which could be regulated in such a way as to make one of the amplitudes several orders of magnitude larger than another. In terms of the ‘scalar’ and ‘tensor’ metric amplitudes this means that $h_T/h_S \approx 1$ for all γ ’s. More accurate calculations along the same lines produce $\mathcal{C} = \sqrt{24\pi}l_{Pl}$ in expression (7) for density perturbations.

Certainly, the correct quantisation procedure (31), (32), as opposed to the incorrect (inflationary) procedure (24), (26), could be formulated from the outset of quantisation. Mathematically, the Lagrangians (13) and (22) are alike, if in (13) one means $\tilde{a}$ by a , and replaces h with ζ .

The derivation of the Hamiltonian for S-perturbations repeats the derivation for gravitational waves. Using the canonical pair $q = \mu$, $p = \partial L/\partial\mu'$ for μ_S , we arrive at the Hamiltonian (compare with Eq.(98) in Ref.[33])

$$\mathbf{H}(\eta) = n\mathbf{c}^\dagger\mathbf{c} + \sigma\mathbf{c}^{\dagger 2} + \sigma^*\mathbf{c}^2, \quad (34)$$

where the coupling to the external field is now given by the function $\sigma(\eta) = (i/2)(\tilde{a}'/\tilde{a})$.

The Heisenberg equations of motion for the Heisenberg operators $\mathbf{c}(\eta)$, $\mathbf{c}^\dagger(\eta)$ lead to classical equation (19). The asymptotic expressions for the Heisenberg operators,

$$\mathbf{c}(\eta) = \mathbf{c}e^{-in(\eta-\eta_0)}, \quad \mathbf{c}^\dagger(\eta) = \mathbf{c}^\dagger e^{in(\eta-\eta_0)},$$

are participating in Eqs. (31), (32). Clearly, the vacuum state $|0\rangle$, defined as $\mathbf{c}(\eta)|0\rangle = 0$, minimises the oscillator's energy (34).

Since at times near η_0 the coefficients a/a_0 and $\tilde{a}/\tilde{a}_0$ are close to 1, the equality of the initial values for h_{rms} and ζ_{rms} follows already from the simple comparison of the Lagrangians (13) and (22).

The relationship between the above-mentioned genuine vacuum state $|0\rangle$ and the squeezed vacuum state $|0_s\rangle$ is determined by the action of the squeeze operator $S(r, \phi)$ on $|0\rangle$:

$$|0_s\rangle = S(r, \phi)|0\rangle,$$

where

$$S(r, \phi) = \exp \left[\frac{1}{2}r \left(e^{-i2\phi} \mathbf{c}^2 - e^{i2\phi} \mathbf{c}^{\dagger 2} \right) \right].$$

The mean number of quanta in the squeezed vacuum state is given by

$$\langle 0_s | \mathbf{c}^\dagger \mathbf{c} | 0_s \rangle = \sinh^2 r = \frac{1 - \gamma}{2\sqrt{\gamma}}.$$

This is a huge and divergent number, when the ‘zero in the denominator’ factor $\sqrt{\gamma}$ goes to zero. Therefore, the “standard inflationary result” for S-perturbations is based on the wrong initial conditions, according to which the initial amplitude of the ζ -perturbations can be arbitrarily large from the very beginning of their evolution.

Moreover, the initial amplitude is assumed to go to infinity in the most interesting limit of $\sqrt{\gamma} \rightarrow 0$ and $n \rightarrow 1$. If $\sqrt{\gamma}$ does not deviate from 1 too much, then the mean number of quanta in the squeezed vacuum state is acceptably small, and the wrong initial conditions give results sufficiently close to the correct ones. However, as in the Landau example mentioned above, if the wrong formula gives acceptable answers for some range of x , this does not make the wrong theory a correct one. (Finally, if $\sqrt{\gamma} = 1$, then $a(t) \propto t$, $a(\eta) \propto e^\eta$, $w = -1/3$. From this model of cosmological evolution the study of relic gravitational waves has began in the first paper of Ref.[2].)

In terms of the classical mode functions, it is the function $\mu/a\sqrt{\gamma}$ that should satisfy the classical version of the initial conditions (31), and not the function μ/a , which is postulated by the inflationary requirement (27). They both are so-called ‘gauge-invariant’ variables, but their physical meaning is drastically different. The original derivations of the “well-known result” were guided simply by the visual analogy between the function $u = \mu$ in theory of density perturbations and the function μ in the theory of gravitational waves already developed by that time.

The assumption of arbitrarily large initial amplitudes of curvature perturbations or, technically speaking, the choice of the initial multi-particle squeezed vacuum state $|0_s\rangle$ for ζ , instead of the ordinary vacuum state $|0\rangle$, is the origin of the absurd “standard inflationary result”. Certainly, this wrong assumption cannot be the basis of observational predictions for cosmology.

5 Conclusions

The grossly incorrect predictions of inflationary theorists should not be the reason for doubts about the existence and expected amount of relic gravitational waves. The generation of relic gravitational waves is based on the validity of general relativity and quantum mechanics in a safe cosmological regime where quantisation of the background gravitational field is not necessary.

In our numerical evaluations, we also assumed that the observed large-angular-scale anisotropies of CMB are caused by cosmological perturbations of quantum-mechanical origin. This is not necessarily true, but it would be quite disastrous if it proved to be untrue.

It is quite a challenge to imagine that the natural and unavoidable quantum-mechanical generation of cosmological perturbations is less effective than anything else. In any case, if relic gravitational waves are not discovered at the (relatively high) level described in this contribution, the implications will be much more serious than the rejection of one inflationary model or another. The reality of our time is such that if the proposal is not properly ‘sexed-up’, it is not very likely to be funded. But the ultimate truth lies in the fact that the real physics of the very early Universe is much more exciting than the artificial hullabaloo over popular words such as ‘inflation’ or ‘inflationary gravitational waves’.

Hopefully, relic gravitational waves will be discovered in experiments, which are already in the well-developed stage. I personally would think that this is likely to happen first in dedicated ground-based observations, such as the recently approved Cardiff-Cambridge-Oxford collaboration CLOVER [41]. Let us hope this will indeed be the case.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to D. Baskaran, J. Romano and especially M. Mensky for fruitful discussions and help, and to P. Steinhardt for calling my attention to the paper [40] and for the accompanying intense and useful correspondence.

References

- [1] Ya. B. Zeldovich, in *Magic without Magic: J A Wheeler*, ed. J. Klauder, (W H Freeman, San Francisco, 1972)
- [2] L. P. Grishchuk. Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **67**, 825 (1974) [Sov. Phys. JETP **40**, 409 (1975)]; Ann. NY Acad. Sci. **302**, 439 (1977)
- [3] L. P. Grishchuk. Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **23**, 326 (1976) [JETP Lett. **23**, 293 (1976)]
- [4] A. H. Guth. Phys. Rev. D **23**, 347 (1981)
- [5] A. D. Sakharov. Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **49**, 345 (1965) [Sov. Phys. JETP **22**, 241 (1966)]
- [6] A. A. Starobinsky. Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **30**, 719 (1979) [JETP Lett. **30**, 719 (1979)]
- [7] V. A. Rubakov, M. V. Sazhin, A. V. Veryaskin. Phys. Lett. B **115**, 189 (1982)
- [8] R. Fabbri and M. D. Pollock. Phys. Lett. B **125**, 445 (1983)
- [9] L. F. Abbot and M. B. Wise. Nucl. Phys. B **244**, 541 (1984)

- [10] V. A. Belinsky, L. P. Grishchuk, I. M. Khalatnikov, Ya. B. Zeldovich. Phys. Lett. B **155**, 232 (1985); Sov. Phys. JETP **62**, 427 (1985)
- [11] L. P. Grishchuk, in *Gyros, Clocks, Interferometers: Testing Relativistic Gravity in Space*, eds. C. Lammerzahl, C. W. Everitt, F. W. Hehl. Lecture Notes in Physics 562 (Springer, 2001) p. 167 (gr-qc/0002035)
- [12] L. P. Grishchuk, in: *Astrophysics Update*, Ed. J. W. Mason (Springer-Praxis, 2004) p. 281 (gr-qc/0305051)
- [13] C. L. Bennet *et al.*. Astroph. J. Suppl. Ser. **148**, 1 (2003)
- [14] L. Page *et al.*. Astroph. J. Suppl. Ser. **148**, 223 (2003)
- [15] G. F. Smoot *et al.* Astroph. J. Lett. **396**, L1 (1992); C. L. Bennet *et al.* Astroph. J. Lett. **464**, L1 (1996)
- [16] D. Maino *al.* Mon. Not. Roy. Ast. Soc. **344**, 562 (2003)
- [17] B. Greene *et al.* Extracting new physics from the CMB. (astro-ph/0503458)
- [18] L. P. Grishchuk and Yu. V. Sidorov. Class. Quant. Grav. **6**, L155 (1989)
- [19] T. Creighton. Gravitational waves and the cosmological equation of state. (gr-qc/9907045)
- [20] LIGO website <http://www.ligo.caltech.edu>
- [21] M. Giovannini. Theoretical tools for CMB physics. (astro-ph/0412601)
- [22] D. Baskaran, L. P. Grishchuk, A. G. Polnarev, *in preparation*
- [23] S. Bose and L. P. Grishchuk. Phys. Rev. D **66**, 043529 (2002)
- [24] M. J. Rees. Astroph. J. **153**, L1 (1968)
- [25] M. M. Basko and A. G. Polnarev. Mon. Not. Roy. Astr. Soc. **191**, 207 (1980)
- [26] A. G. Polnarev. Astron. Zh. **62**, 1041 (1985) [Sov. Astron. **29**, 607 (1985)]

- [27] J. R. Bond and G. Efstathiou. *Astroph. J.* **285**, L45 (1984)
- [28] M. Zaldariaga and U. Seljak. *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 1830 (1997)
- [29] M. Kamionkowski, A. Kosowsky, and A. Stebbins. *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 7368 (1997)
- [30] W. Hu and M. White. *New Astronomy*. **2**, 323 (1997) (astro-ph/9706147)
- [31] L. P. Grishchuk. Comment on the “Influence of Cosmological Transitions on the Evolution of Density Perturbations”. (gr-qc/9801011)
- [32] L. P. Grishchuk and Yu. V. Sidorov. *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 3413 (1990)
- [33] L. P. Grishchuk. *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 7154 (1994)
- [34] L. P. Grishchuk. *Class. Quant. Gravity* **10**, 2449 (1993)
- [35] J. M. Bardeen, P. J. Steinhardt, and M. S. Turner. *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, 679 (1983)
- [36] V. N. Lukash. *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **31**, 631 (1980) [*JETP Lett.* **6**, 596 (1980)]
- [37] G. Chibisov and V. Mukhanov. *Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc.* **200**, 535 (1982)
- [38] M. Sasaki. *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **76**, 1036 (1986)
- [39] J. Maldacena. Non-gaussian features of primordial fluctuations in single field inflationary models. (astro-ph/0210603 v4)
- [40] J. Maldacena. *JHEP*05 (2003) 013
- [41] A. Taylor *et al.*, in *Proceedings of 39th Recontres de Moriond* (Frontiers, 2004)